

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/955,171	09/19/2001	Seizou Miyazaki	Q66275	9417
7:	590 01/26/2005	EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			SMITH, JULIE KNECHT	
	nnia Avenue, N.W. OC 20037-3202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
washington, 2	2002, 2202		3682	-
•			DATE MAILED: 01/26/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- 1				
1.		Application No.	Applicant(s)	TP P
N		09/955,171	MIYAZAKI ET AL.	·
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Julie K Smith	3682	
Darin	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	-
	SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	V IS SET TO EXPIRE 3	MONTH(S) FROM	
Th -   -   -	HE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply five to reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing partned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may oly within the statutory minimum of t I will apply and will expire SIX (6) M te. cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communic ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	eation.
Status	5			
1)	□ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 (</u>	October 2004.		
•	•	is action is non-final.		
3)	<del>_</del>	ance except for formal ma	atters, prosecution as to the merit	ts is
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Dispo	sition of Claims			
5) 6) 7)	Claim(s) <u>15</u> is/are objected to.	awn from consideration.		
8)		or election requirement.	,	
	cation Papers			
	☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin		historia de horthe Francisco	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2004 is/are:			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	-, ,		21(d)
11)	☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	•		
Priori	ty under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)	<ul> <li>Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a)  All b)  Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1.  Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2.  Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>application from the International Bureat</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	nts have been received.  Its have been received in ority documents have been received in ority documents have been received.	Application No en received in this National Stage	<b>!</b>
Attachr 1)	nent(s) lotice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) 🗖 Intende	v Summary (PTO-413)	
	lotice of References Cited (P10-892)  Iotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper N	o(s)/Mail Date	
	nformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 aper No(s)/Mail Date	5)	f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 3682

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Response to Letter

In response to the letter received on 10/5/04, the previous office action, mailed 7/13/04, has been vacated and a new office action is being submitted due to a correction in the disposition of claims in the previous office action.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mineta et al. (5,047,677). Mineta et al. disclose a bearing assembly comprising a housing (6), a shaft (1), a pair of roller bearings (4,8), wherein the shaft has a reduced diameter portion (see fig. 1) having an outer diameter smaller than the inner diameter of an inner ring and a width which is larger than an axial width of the raceway, such that inner circumferential surfaces located at distal ends of said inner ring are interference fit onto the shaft and an intermediate portion of said inner ring is clearance fitted to the shaft.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3682

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Olaims 13-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mineta et al. as applied to claims 1 and 4 above. Mineta et al. discloses a clearance gap located between the shaft and an outer surface of an inner ring, however, Mineta et al. does not disclose the amount of clearance or run-out provided for the bearing assembly.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to minimize the clearance and run-out of the bearing assembly, as it is old and well known in the art that these specification must be minimized in order to reduce vibration and increase the efficiency of a bearing.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply and adhesive to the shaft so as to secure the bearings to the shaft, as using an adhesive to secure two objects is old and well-known.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 5-12 are allowed.
- 7. Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3682

## Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 3/12/04 regarding claims 1, 4, 8-11 and 16 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 4, Applicant argues that Mineta et al. does not disclose the center portion of the reduced diameter part of the shaft being located at an intersection point of a line connecting ball contact points on the inner and outer rings. However, Mineta et al. discloses multiple contact points on both rings, therefore, a line connecting two of those points would intersect with the center of the reduced diameter portion.

Regarding claims 12, 13 and 16, Applicant argues that the claimed dimensions would not have been obvious. However, it is the opinion of the examiner that providing a certain amount of clearance for assembly, but not enough clearance for increased vibrations is obvious in the bearing art as it is the goal of bearing design to reduce vibrations and noise within bearings. Applicant should provide evidence of non-obviousness and unexpected results obtained from the claimed dimensions.

#### Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3682

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julie K Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-3948. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8-5:30, (Every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Bucci can be reached on 703-308-3668. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jks Jks

January 12, 2005

SUPERVISORY PATERT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600